EQUAL RIGHTS

"MEN AND WOMEN SHALL HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES AND EVERY PLACE SUBJECT TO ITS JURISDICTION"

Amendment to the United States Constitution now before Congress

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY, Washington, D. C.

Vol. 28, No. 4 APRIL, 1942

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
CENTRAL
APR 20 1942
COPY 1

Katharine Hepburn Endorses Equal Rights Amendment

—(Photo by Harris & Ewing, Washington, D. C.)

KATHARINE HEPBURN, famous stage and movie star, is the niece of Mrs. Edith Houghton Hooker, former Chairman of the National Woman's Party and for years the Editor of EQUAL RIGHTS.

During her recent visit to Washington, starring in Philip Barry's new comedy "Without Love," Miss Hepburn, with clear vision, took time to send the following message to the National Woman's Party:

> "In the theatre there is complete equality between men and women. We have men and women playwrights, actors, scenic artists, press agents and stage managers. If that has worked well for the theatre, why not for all walks of life? I have just heard that hospitals where internes have gone to war hesitate to take women doctors, although they are available, and industrial concerns that need doctors still discriminate against women doctors. This attitude toward women goes back to the fundamental law of our country. That is why I support the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, reading:
>
> "'Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.'"
>
> (*Signed*) KATHARINE HEPBURN.

Equal Rights

Official Organ
of the
NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY
Capitol Hill Washington, D. C.
Phone Atlantic 1210

Published Monthly at
144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

Entered as second-class matter at the post-office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Subscription, $1.00 a Year
Foreign Subscription, $1.50

MRS. HARVEY W. WILEY . . . . . Editor
DORA G. OGLE . . . . . Business Manager

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

ALMA LUTZ INEZ HAYNES IRWIN
EDITH HOUGHTON HOOKER HELEN ROBBINS BITTERMANN
MIRIAM E. OATMAN, Ph. D.

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

OBJECT

To secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships—in particular to secure the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution, and the adherence of the United States to the Equal Rights Treaty. The Woman's Party also supports the Proposed Equality Amendments to the Covenant of the League of Nations.

THE PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

"Art. 1—Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

"Art. 2—Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

WORLD WOMAN'S PARTY FOR EQUAL RIGHTS

ALICE PAUL, Chairman

EXCERPT FROM CONSTITUTION.

Object: The object of this organization shall be to advance the Status of Women throughout the world, and to promote the recognition and establishment of liberty without distinction as to sex.

Status Of Amendment

March 16, 1942.

MRS AMY C. RANSOME,
533 South San Marino Avenue,
Pasadena, California.

Dear Mrs. Ransome:

I desire to acknowledge receipt of your letter under date of March 14th, with reference to the Equal Rights Amendment.

While I appreciate the interest of your organization in securing consideration on this proposed amendment, the matter of bringing the matter up is entirely up to the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana. I would suggest that your communications be addressed to him.

Sincerely yours,

(*Signed*) JAMES H. HUGHES.

* * *

March 18, 1942.

Dear Mrs. Ransome:

In answer to your communication of the 14th, I would suggest that you write to Senator James H. Hughes, who is in charge of the legislation concerning which you write.

I appreciate your members' comments on the matter and thank you for your letter.

Respectfully yours,

(*Signed*) FREDERICK VAN NUYS.

The buried seed precedes the bursting bud! One phase of the Easter message implies that Sacrifice comes before Victory! To protect our beloved Democracy and enlarge it, by granting equal constitutional status to men and women, means sacrifice and victory for all.

Democracy And Equal Rights

In two recent issues of EQUAL RIGHTS two men have shown the way and the terms of what women should do to strengthen democracy. One of these friends of justice is the Roman Catholic Bishop of Wilmington, Bishop FitzMaurice, who, at the Eastern Regional Conference of the National Woman's Party, prayed: "we would join with all noble souls in warring against discriminations and injustices of which women are still the victims . . ." The other friend of justice is Senator Kilgore from West Virginia who, in the crypt of the Capitol on the Anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony, reminded women that "education must . . . bring home to all of our womenfolk the realization that with Equal Rights goes equal responsibility."

What actually can we as members of the National Woman's Party do for Democracy today? . . . EQUAL RIGHTS is edited and published by the Party. In this Journal are articles by distinguished men and women, editorials and letters, reports from the State Chairmen, the National Executive Council and the Congressional Committee on the progress of the EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT, records of the work of past members and also of women who are not members, and reprints of articles concerned with the work of women. *And it can be said truthfully that every word in* EQUAL RIGHTS *is about or has to do with Democracy—that Total Democracy which does not discriminate against women but admits women to all the rights and privileges common in democratic government.*

We can help that Democracy by sending *NOW* subscriptions for EQUAL RIGHTS to non-members of our acquaintance, men as well as women: young women, young men and the middle-aged and the elderly who are not "frozen-minded." The writer would count it a privilege to be one of one hundred or two hundred or three hundred of the National Woman's Party, to guarantee twelve subscriptions for EQUAL RIGHTS—one for each month of the year for a year. Such a plan at its best would mean 3,600 "years" or 43,000 "months" of information about Democracy and of influence upon possible new members. Such a campaign would bring in many new members in the most critical year in the history of women and our struggle for freedom. With EQUAL RIGHTS let us do all we can, while we can! JEANNETTE MARKS.

National Executive Council

A meeting of the Natl. Executive Council of the Natl. W. P. was held at the Prince George Hotel, New York City, on Sat., Mar. 28th. Mrs. Wiley entertained the Council at dinner, preceding the meeting.

The following members attended: Mrs. Ransome, who flew from California, Mrs. Williams, Miss Berrien who drove from Washington with Dr. Sebree and Mrs. Allender; Miss Lutz, who left a family gathering to attend; Miss Pollitzer and Mrs. Buenzli, who remained in New York for four days of intensive work following the meeting; and Miss Paul, who plowed through the heavy Vermont snows to reach the city.

A resolution reaffirming the support of the Lucretia Mott Amendment by the National Woman's Party was unanimously adopted. Another resolution declaring the Council does not support the proposal offered by Senator O'Mahoney was also unanimously adopted.

The following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That in the recent death of Miss A. Hermine Stauber, of Boise, Idaho, Chairman of that State Branch of the N. W. P., the Executive Council has lost a valued worker and a close friend.

Mandatory Joint Income Tax Proposal

ANNA KELTON WILEY

HEARINGS in opposition to the mandatory joint income tax were held before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, March 25th and 26th, the Hon. Robt. L. Doughton, Chairman, presiding.

The twenty witnesses, whose testimony covered fifteen hours, all appeared in opposition to the proposal. Nine representatives of over three million organized women appeared to protest the enactment of this measure as follows: Miss Laura *Berrien,* lawyer and tax expert, the National Woman's Party; Mrs. John W. *Buwalda,* assorted civic organizations of California; Miss Catherine *Curtis,* Women Investors in America Inc.; Miss Mary H. *Donlon,* lawyer, Natl. Fed. of Business & Professional Women, Inc.; Hon Sarah T. *Hughes,* judge of the 14th District, Dallas, Texas, *Texas* Committee on Federal Taxation and the Zonta Club; Hon. Dorothy *Kenyon,* lawyer, Natl. Amer. Assn. .of University Women; Mrs. Ethel Ernest *Murrell,* lawyer, Natl. Assn. of Women Lawyers; Mrs. Margaret F. *Stone, Natl.* Women's Trade Union League; and Mrs. Harvey W. *Wiley,* Genl. Fed. of Women's Clubs.

The following representatives of Chambers of Commerce, Representatives in Congress, judges, lawyers and spokesmen for tax paying groups appeared: Rep. F. H. *Buck,* Cal.; Rep. John J. *Cochran,* Mo.; Judge George *Donworth,* Seattle, Wash.; Chas. E. *Dunbar, Louisiana* Community Property Taxpayers Committee; Mr. Wm. *Greenough,* Attorney at law of N. Y.; Rep. Carl *Hinshaw,* Cal.; James C. *Ingebretsen,* Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; John C. *Jackson,* President, N. Y. State Bar Assn.; Joseph G. *Montague,* Genl. Counsel, Texas & Southwestern Cattle Growers Assn.; Rep. Thomas *Rolph,* Cal., and Rep. Hatton W. *Sumners,* Texas, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Briefs and resolutions were put in the record from the *Arizona* Federation of Women's Clubs; Margaret Caulkin *Banning;* Mrs. Esto B. *Broughton;* Thalia Newton *Brown,* Amer. Women's Assn.; Mrs. Carrie Chapman *Catt,* nationally known feminist; Wm. H. *Courtney;* Sidney M. *Ehrman,* for the State Wide Tax Com. of Cal.; Rep. Leland M. *Ford,* Cal.; Mrs. Clement B. *Fox,* Pres. Ariz. Fed. of Women's Clubs; Mrs. Wm. E. *Hansen,* Pres. Women's Civic League of Pasadena, Cal.; Lucy M. *Higgins,* Ch. Leg. Boise B. & P. Club; *Joint* Com. Int. Rev. Taxation; Ed. D. *Lansdels; N. Y. State Bar Assn.* Resolution and Report; and C. J. S. *Williamson.*

Quoting from the direct testimony of two of the witnesses; Miss Mary H. Donlon, lawyer, Natl. Fed. of Business & Professional Women, Inc.:

(Page references are to the pages of the Hearings on Revenue Revision of 1942. Mar. 25, 26, Nos. 15, 16.)

I think, if we lift our eyes beyond our own horizon, we can see why there is this opposition to the mandatory joint income tax, believing as we do that it is a step backward in the direction of the state of the law as it was before the married women's property acts were enacted. We feel that it is a beginning in the direction taken in Germany, for example, where before racial and religious persecution set in, there was first of all legislation discriminating against married women and then against all women, and finally against other citizens.

As you know, the married women property acts in this country were enacted approximately a century ago, in my own state of New York, in 1848.

The New York law, about which I can speak with a little more authority than about the laws of the other states, contains a provision in the domestic relations law, sec. 50, that the property real or personal, of a married woman, and the rents, issues, proceeds and profits thereof shall continue to be her sole and separate property as if she were unmarried.

Now we feel that there is significance in that expression "as if she were unmarried," and remembering that the power to tax is the power to destroy, we feel that taxation on a basis that distinguishes between her as married and as unmarried, is discriminatory and contrary to the spirit of the married women's property acts." (Page 1194)

* * *

The Secretary of the Treasury advanced as a reason, as I take it, the legal reason, for this legislation, that the family is an economic unit and presumably by that he intended that it was also such a unit as in law would constitute a permissible tax classification. That, of course, is not a new idea. It is an idea as old as history, 1000 years old at least, as Mr. Justice Holmes said (in the Hoeper case). And it was the idea of course, that gave the husband his wife's property. It made a very strong and economic unit of the family, and, as I indicated a moment ago, I think neither the women nor the men of this country desire to return to that position. (Page 1195)

* * *

I would like to refer briefly to the earned-income proviso, which was suggested by the Treasury, and I assume was intended to mitigate the rigors of the mandatory joint return.

I just want to say that it makes for a complexity of computation of income-tax returns that seem to go beyond anything we have yet had to contend with. (Page 1195)

* * *

If there is a possibility that mandatory joint returns are constitutional—and I do not believe they are—but if there is such a possibility, of course, it imposes a heavy burden of responsibility on the Congress and particularly on this committee charged with, the important responsibility of drafting and presenting a bill to the House; a heavy responsibility for determining what is wise tax policy.

Heretofore such differentiation as there has been between the income-tax liability of single persons and married persons has been on the side of favoring the marital status. I assume it is fair to say that in this country there has been a public policy of favoring the marital status. That has been evidenced by permitting joint returns.

I wish to differ from the position stated before you by the Secretary of the Treasury who referred to the separate returns of married persons as a privilege intolerable, I think he said in time of war.

Almost from the time of enactment of the first income-tax act, as you gentlemen know, there has been the obligation on every individual having income in excess of a stated minimum, to file a return. But since the 1918 act, the Congress has given a favorable option to married couples, by permitting them in their election, and if they found it advantageous to them to do so, to file a joint return. It seems to me the shoe is on the other foot, that far from having now under the act a privilege of filing separate returns, it should be stated as an obligation to file separate returns and a privilege, if the couple elect to do so, to file a joint return.

At times the marital status has also been favored by granting an exemption to married persons in excess of two single exemptions and there have been from time to time evidences of a public policy in that direction. It is a serious thing to reverse that public policy and adopt a contrary policy of penalizing the marital status by requiring the payment of higher taxes by those who are married. (Page 1197)

* * *

In indirect testimony in answer to the question from Rep. Knudson to the effect: " * * * you certainly cannot defend a taxing system that gives one class of citizens, the citizens of one group of States, an outstanding advantage over the citizens of other States."

Miss Donlon said: "I defend any taxing system, sir, that in a democracy imposes taxes on the individual with relation to that individual's own income, under circumstances similar to all other individuals and I oppose any system of taxation that would impose taxation at higher rates because of marital status. (Page 1202)

* * *

In reply to another statement by Rep. Knudson, to the effect " * * * the women of America will be called upon to make some sacrifices * * * "

(Continued on page 31)

Women And Government

COL. O. R. McGUIRE

Formerly Counsel to the Comptroller General of the United States and Special Assistant Attorney General of the United States
Chairman, Special Committee on Administrative Law, American Bar Association

(Address delivered before the Annual Convention of the National Association of Women Lawyers, Indianapolis, Indiana, Sept. 28, 1941)

Madam President and Fellow Lawyers:

I am privileged this morning to speak to serious-minded women who have chosen a serious profession, that of the Law. I propose to speak to you for a short time in a serious vein because levity would be out of place today with three-fourths of the world in flames and our own country torn with dissention, staggering under an overwhelming burden of taxation, and feverishly attempting to rearm both ourselves and the allied countries faced with a mighty military machine brought to a high state of efficiency. I mention these things, not for purposes of discussion, but as something of a background for a question which I propose to put to you and which I shall try to answer: Why is it that the adoption of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the right recognized in women to participate in elections and to hold public office has made so little change in the practices and procedures of our own Government?

It will be remembered that in the pagan world of ancient Egypt, woman had rights which she subsequently lost in the magnification of the male of the species. She had the right to participate in government; she could hold property; descent was traced through the female and not the male line; she had a definite place in the religious system; and a woman was the most famous ruler Egypt has ever had. Indeed, we are told that the matriarchial system antedated the patriarchial system but with the rise of monotheism and the teaching by men of the terrible sins visited upon the world through the transgressions of Eve in the garden of Eden, women lost their honored legal status and, in fact, became something of a chattel. She retains that chattel status in much of the world today, but here in America, women have been greatly honored, as well as loved; she has long had substantial, and she has now equal, educational advantages with men; and to a large extent she occupies at least an equal if not in some respects, a superior legal status in the United States.

Much of the wealth of the Nation is in the hands of women; they are the principal beneficiaries of most of life insurance policies; and they are indeed the friend, comforter, and mother of men. Their influence in home and in church is indeed very great and it is safe to say that upon the women rests the principal responsibility for the sanctity of the home and the preservation of our morals. However, it is only figuratively true that the hand which rocks the cradle rules the world—assuming that the sweet young things of today have about such articles as cradles! There are few good and great men who do not readily admit the great influence in their lives of their mothers, wives and sweethearts. But it would not be true if we concluded that the advent of women in American politics has led to any substantial improvement in either the practice or procedure of governments.

With the times out of joint, I am interested in getting at the reason for this lack of influence of women in politics—and after all, they constitute at least half of the population in most states and in other more than half. Also, being a mere man, I intend to venture a suggestion how such influence can be increased to the great benefit of our common country and perhaps of civilization itself.

When women secured the ballot by the adoption of the Nineteenth Amendment, she entered an arena where there were two principal political parties. These were the political parties of the men. The women joined such parties, very often the parties to which their fathers, husbands or sweethearts belonged. The only substantial result which I can detect in the enfranchisement of women in the United States is that we have approximately twice as many registered voters in each of the two principal parties as we had before such enfranchisement. I have made no study of the minor political parties but I would hazard the guess that they have increased in registered adherents in about the same proportion.

But when women gave their adherence to one or the other of the two principal parties she did little or nothing to clean them up; to improve their practices and procedures; or to improve the standard of their candidates or their performances in office. And most certainly she did not exact as the price of her support any equal distribution of public offices. Male politicians of the two principal political parties are very considerate of the racial vote, the labor vote, and the religious vote and in more or less closely divided elections these politicians are very careful to have candidates who may draw to their tickets support from all principal racial groups, religious groups, and from labor. Some of these racial groups may head the ticket but concessions to the women vote are largely ignored by the politicians because they have learned that the women can be counted upon to vote as their men-folk.

Women A Conservative Element

I think that women are, for the most part, a conservative element in our life. Certainly this is true in domestic finances, religion and morals. Many a man has kept his nose to the grindstone, conserved his earnings and led a fairly decent life because there was some dear little woman in the background who kept him from chasing off after will-o-the-wisps. It is the woman who is most greatly concerned that there be a reasonable home income; that there be a fixed place of abode; that her sons and daughters achieve a higher place in life than she or her husband have been able to achieve; and who is most opposed to crime, extravagance and fraud? I submit that the world today is most in need of this conservative element which only women can supply and I call your attention to the fact that from those totalitarian countries where woman is only a little above the status of feudal times and is apparently without any influence that there has recently emerged the greatest danger to civilization itself!

Scarcity Of Women Public Office

Why is it that there are scarcely no women on the Federal District Courts; but one on the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and there are eleven of such courts; and none on the Supreme Court of the United States? There is only one in the Senate and three or four in the House of Representatives and all of them

are practically without influence so far as the women of the country or women's problems are concerned. Incidentally, it will be of interest to know that approximately twenty women are members of the Parliament of the Republic of Turkey—a land where ten years ago women were veiled inmates of harems! Do you suppose that if the Irish vote, the Jewish vote, the Catholic vote, the Negro vote, the Italian vote, the German vote, or the labor vote in the United States was approximately half of the vote in the entire country that these groups would have any such meagre showing as the American women either in the number of public offices held by members of such groups or in their political influence? You know it would not be so.

Why should we not have the women's group or bloc working closely together, forming a cohesive organization, and demanding their fair share of the public offices and political reforms which all women know we should have if this world is not only to be made a better place in which to live but for civilization as we know it to continue to exist? I think we should have such an organization of women, working primarily through women and for issues that appeal to women—they will be issues which will improve the homes, add security to our institutions of government, protect the investments of the people, and which will curb both predatory wealth and predatory selfish groups—whether of labor, agriculture, capitalists, or theoretical social reformers! The women lawyers, for instance, almost to a woman supported the Logan-Walter Bill, which had as its sole purpose an attempt to improve the administration of justice in these United States so that government might not become the master but remain the servant of the people. It is not too much to say that the women were more vigorous and helpful in the fight to get that bill through Congress than were most of the men lawyers. As a result of that fight, I think we surely have arrested a dangerous development in government and that sooner or later we shall have a reasonable reform in the practices and procedures of administrative agencies.

Leadership Needed

Women in their clubs, their offices, and elsewhere generally have more time to think of these grave problems than do the men; and I am not forgetting the vast number of women who either from inclination or necessity are breadwinners for themselves and families. Professional women can and should furnish much of the leadership, while the volunteer workers from among those who do not have to work for their livelihood would be a tremendous asset in any political campaign. More than that, these women could keep your fences in order while you were serving in public office in Washington, at your State capitals, or elsewhere. Surely individual women may trust each other to the extent of working together for the common good of all.

Realizing that mere man may never have the last word, I venture to suggest that the time has come in America for the women to develop and weave their own peculiar interests into a women's movement; that such movement will support women for public office who would be an honor and a credit to a great and free government; and that through such movement women will use their balance of power between the two old political parties to force needed governmental reforms, to bring about a better way of life with enlarged opportunities for all the people, and to secure for the women a fair measure of the public offices so that they may be on the firing line to see that their policies are carried out. If all the good women of America would get militantly behind a movement, nothing could stop its success. . . .

(Printed by permission by the author and the Natl. Assn. of Women Lawyers)

Status Of Woman Suffrage In The Western Hemisphere

On May 16th, 1942, the women of the *Dominican Republic* will vote in a political election for the first time, in the history of that country. The woman suffrage law was passed in January, 1942. The Napoleonic Code has also been reformed to give women more civil rights. Part of the credit for the passage of this law is due Miss Minerva Bernardino, Vice-Chairman of the Inter-American Commission of Women, an outstanding educator and feminist leader of her country.

At the present time national woman suffrage exists in six of the twenty-one American Republics: The *United States* (1920); *Brazil* and *Uruguay* (1932); *Cuba* (1934); *El Salvador* (1939) and *Dominican Republic* (1942).

In two of the American Republics women have the right to vote in municipal elections: *Chile* (1934) *and Peru* (1935). Four nations limit the vote to men by specific provision of the constitution: Columbia (1886, amended 1936); Guatemala (1879); Honduras (1936) and Venezuela (1936).

In *Panama*, by the Constitution of Jan. 1, 1941, Art. 61: The legislature may confer citizenship on women. The Election Law of July 5, 1941, Art. 2: Panamanian women over 21 who possess a diploma from a University or a vocational, normal or secondary school, may vote and hold office in elections for representatives to the provincial assemblies.

In *Paraguay*, the Constitution of July 10, 1940, Art. 38: Military service is obligatory for citizens . . . Art. 39; All citizens have the duty of voting from the age of 18 years.

The remaining seven countries—*Argentina, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Haiti, Mexico,* and *Nicaragua*—use the ambiguous word "national" in the articles of the constitution relative to suffrage.

Some of these seven countries have at one time granted suffrage to women, or have taken some action to do so. In *Argentina*, a bill to grant the vote to women passed the Chamber of Deputies, but since it failed to pass in the Senate, it never became law. The Province of San Juan, however, permits women to vote, and at the elections held July 22, 1934, a woman was elected to the provincial legislature.

Ecuador granted suffrage to women in the constitution of 1929 and the privilege was retained in the new constitution adopted by the Constituent Assembly in December, 1938, but never promulgated. Instead an earlier constitution, that of 1906, was declared in force, and in that document, as in the electoral law of March 1, 1939, women as voters are not specifically mentioned. In 1938 when the matter was in course of being weighed many groups of American women passed resolutions asking the President of Ecuador to use his influence to preserve woman suffrage for the women of his country.

The *Mexican* government took the stand in a communication of March 20, 1935, that there were no reasons, technical or otherwise, for not including women in citizenship, and thereby permitting them to vote. To clarify the situation, however, a constitutional amendment giving women the vote was drafted. In 1938, it was passed by the Senate and the House, and referred to the States for ratification. Although President Cardenas in his message to Congress of Sept. 1, 1938, urged that prompt action be taken, the amendment has not yet become law, according to the most recent information from official sources.

The *Nicaraguan* constitution of 1939 has prepared the way for woman's suffrage. It states that citizens are Nicaraguans over 21 and those over 18 who can read and write. The obligations of citizens include military service, but women are exempt therefrom and their right to vote shall be determined by law.

Although the *Columbian* constitution as amended in 1936, states that only men are considered citizens and the quality of active citizenship is a prerequisite for voting and holding office, women who are of age may hold office if they satisfy the requirements that the law specifies for citizens.

Since the Latin American nations achieved independence, women have been increasingly active outside the home. In the early days of the Argentine Republic, women founded the Sociedad de Beneficencia to which President Rivadavia entrusted the protection and education of girls; for nearly 120 years it has carried on an ever-enlarging work, and now administers general and specialized hospitals, homes for the aged, insane and orphans, sanitariums, fresh-air camps and other institutions. In Argentina also the Union Argentina de Mujeres, whose president is Sra. Ana Rosa de Martinez Guerrero, is carrying on a campaign for increased civil and political rights for women. Sra. de Martinez is also the chairman of the Inter-American Commission of Women, founded by the National Woman's Party, now an official Pan American body.

Note. The facts in this article were kindly furnished by the Pan American Union.

A School Man Speaks For Equal Rights

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT VINCENT P. MAHER of the Los Angeles City Schools spoke eloquently before the Resolutions Committee of the San Francisco Convention of the American Association of School Administrators on February 20th. He urged endorsement of the Equal Rights Amendment and said: "I realize that this committee has many important resolutions to consider today. There is none which is more important than that which has been presented to you by Superintendent Warren, (the resolution endorsing the Equal Rights Amendment). With your permission I should like to add briefly why I think you should recommend this resolution for adoption by our convention.

"At the present time there are about 1,100,000 teachers in the United States. Of this number 820,000, or about three-fourths, are women. We are asking these teachers, through our educational program, to teach our boys and girls that free democratic principles abound in this land, and that *full citizenship* is accorded all. We are asking these teachers also to inculcate in the minds of our boys and girls a love for the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

"This our teachers are doing irrespective of the fact that women are not full citizens under the Constitution and laws of the United States and under the constitution and law of the respective states wherein they may reside.

"True, women may now vote after being denied their inalienable rights for so many years; they must pay taxes; they must pay equal penalties for the crimes they may commit. However, many laws throughout the United States still discriminate against women. There is this one thing we must remember: such rights and privileges as have been granted by states or Congress may be repealed at the will of either of these bodies. This is the outstanding reason why an amendment to the Constitution of the United States must be made if equal justice for men and women alike is to be permanent.

"Today we are fighting to make the world free—let us here make our women free. Today our men are going to the front to do battle—our women are picking up the tools they have laid down. The modern woman is facing dangers and hardships just like her pioneer ancestors.

"Today at Lockheed Aircraft a woman directs forty experts in the structural department. Two of the foremost electrical engineers at General Electric also are women. I point to these two examples because they are significant in the present economic situation. Women are doing important work in every profession and every craft today. In the airplane industry they are coming in by the thousands.

"In asking your favorable consideration of this resolution I should like to point out that it will free men as well as women. It will raise the standards of employment for men because women will not be permitted to work under the same conditions which exist for men today. It will indeed be the emancipation of men as well as women.

"Ours is a noble profession. I remember an incident which happened several years ago in one of our eastern states: The main school building had attached to it another wing built at right angles which was used as a library and study room. On this particular day a violent storm swept down upon the school building and was followed by a terrific wind. As the building trembled under the lash of the storm, the teacher commanded her young students to crawl under the tables. When the one large door trembled under the whip of the wind she threw her frail body against it to hold it shut. Then the fury of the storm broke and the beams, girders, bricks were all torn from their moorings.

"When the rescue party rushed from the main building and frantically cleared away the debris, they found every pupil alive and unhurt. Only the crushed body of the teacher told the story of the storm.

"I should like to ask, if you would deny any citizenship right to our boys fighting at the front for our democracy. I know your answer would be NO. Now may I ask you why you should deny full citizenship rights to such teachers and citizens as that noble woman whom I have just described?

"Every male citizen, white or black, brown or yellow, has full rights under the Constitution of the United States, but not so women. Today we are fighting Japan, and yet a man of Japanese parentage born in this country and therefore a citizen has more rights than an American woman.

"In this resolution we are asking for social justice. Dr. Strayer this morning asked us to remember the sacredness of the human personality. I ask you as leaders in a great profession to consider the sacredness of the personality of our women and act favorably in the presentation and adoption of this resolution."

Mrs. Ella Vollstedt Allen

At the conclusion of Mr. Maher's address, Mrs. Ella Vollstedt Allen spoke briefly and to the point. She said:

"Since the Superintendent's Section of the N. E. A. represents the leadership of the Public Schools of the Nation, it seems appropriate to present to this Resolutions Committee the view held by large groups of citizens on the 'legal status' of women. The Educational Policy Committee of the N. E. A. has advocated for years a program of full equality for boys and girls. To be consistent with that policy there must be equality under the law for these young people when they go forth into the adult world to make a living. For educators not to recognize that it is their duty to extend this very basic principle of democracy is to be inconsistent with what they preach. For the Resolutions Committee to contend that this question should not be considered before this group because it is of a *political nature*, again is not valid reasoning. The N. E. A. took a stand on the Child Labor Amendment. May I ask if teachers can't come to the N. E. A. Resolutions Committee with social, political and economic problems that directly effect the future of our boys and girls of this nation, to whom can they go? One Superintendent suggested that there might be something wrong with the N. E. A.'s organization!"

Subscription Contest Award

Although many of the States have broken their own records in sending new subscriptions during the past month, the award will go to Florida, because the greatest number of NEW subscriptions came from Jane Wardlaw Prettyman of Miami, Florida.

The contest begins again in April. Please start on your list of friends, libraries, legislators, Governors, reading rooms, hospitals, doctors, dentist offices and beauty parlors. Try to secure for your State the award for securing the greatest number of new subscriptions for EQUAL RIGHTS during April.

DORA OGLE.

Books For Library

On April 11th, Maryland Day at National Headquarters, Mrs. Dorothy Shipley Granger on behalf of the Business and Professional Women's Council, N. W. P. Maryland, of which she is the Chairman, presented the Alva Belmont Library with two volumes of "Famous Maryland Women," by Margie Luckett, as a tribute to Edith Houghton Hooker. See next issue for full account.

Mandatory Joint Income Tax Proposal

(*Continued from page 27*)

Miss Donlon replied: "I am almost chilled to the heart by your remarks because, first of all I should like to say that you are entirely correct in stating that the women of this country are prepared to make every possible effort to winning the war. We realize that and are already responding to very exacting demands and will continue to do so. And I hazard the guess that we will do it in a degree beyond the contribution of the men, for this reason; that women have the most to lose if democracy is lost. It is only in a democratic society that women can achieve the freedom of opportunity and the place as individuals that they hold in this, our country.

"Now, as to willingness to pay taxes and to make all the sacrifices that we may be called upon to make, we are willing to pay taxes and we are glad, we business and professional women, that we work and have the ability to pay taxes; and hard as it seems on March 15 to write out the check, we are glad that we are able to do so. And we are willing to pay next year the higher rates. But we do not want to pay any taxes or to have our State legislatures or *our Congress enact any bill that turns the calendar back for women, because to do so for the sake of deriving revenues would be to sacrifice the very victory we are fighting to save.*" (Page 1203)

* * *

In reply to a criticism of Rep. Knudson:—"I dare say when the time comes, labor will make somewhat the same argument. They will say, 'We fought for the 40-hour week for half a century; we fought for the principle of time and half for overtime' * * *"

Miss Donlon stated: "Sir, I speak for a group that invites sacrifices. I wish to say that no one who comes before you is perhaps any closer to labor than I, or more interested in its welfare. That is why I am somewhat in the low-income bracket to which this mandatory joint return proposal descends. But I do want to say that basically, I would suppose the 40-hour week, admirable as it is in normal times, is hardly one of those fundamental struggles of democratic society to establish the right of the individual, that the Married Woman's Property Act was." (Pages 1203-1204)

* * *

Judge Dorothy Kenyon, speaking for the Natl. A. A. U. W., said in part:

The A. A. U. W. was founded in 1882 at a time when educational opportunities for women were limited, when prejudice against higher education for women was still strong and when women who had succeeded in securing advanced training found few openings waiting for them, it was hoped that by banding together these women could open the doors of opportunity to other women in the educational world and secure for all women a fuller share of intellectual life. This has been its program ever since. It works, as it has always worked, for the enlargement of opportunities for trained women through practical efforts to secure their advancement.

One hundred years ago such an organization could not have existed. One hundred years ago there were practically no women's colleges in this country, no women were educated beyond the grammar school at most, there were no professional women—doctors, lawyers, and so forth—or women scholars as we understand the term today. Perhaps some of you wish that those days would return. Those were indeed the dark ages, the days when in the inimitable words of Blackstone, husband and wife were one and that one was the husband.

Those days we had thought were gone forever. But surprisingly enough such appears not to be the case. For today we are gathered together to discuss a matter which goes to the fundamentals of that long and arduous fight of women for freedom and for recognition as individuals in their own right. The proposal before us today, in the opinion of many of us, would take us a long way back toward those days of ignorance and slavery.

First, I want to make plain that our organization is 100 percent behind the great battle for freedom in which our country is now engaged. Every member of the A. A. U. W., I am convinced, is playing her part in our all-out war for freedom and is ready to make sacrifices to the limit. Insofar as taxation is a necessary part of that war effort we of the A. A. U. W. are 100 per cent for it. Taxation holds no terrors for us. It is a part of the fight for freedom in which we are all engaged. We do not come here today to object to increased taxation. We want to make that very clear, Mr. Chairman. On the contrary we favor it. But it is precisely *because the tax is for freedom and not for slavery that we voice our objections today.*

Judge Kenyon then made the following five points:

First. As to the fundamental issue of women's freedom. Women have waged a great battle over the last 100 years for their freedom as individuals. * * * *Second.* This fundamental issue of freedom cannot be disposed of by saying that the proposal applies only to a limited group of women, and those the richer members of society, and that since it is the intention largely to exempt unearned as distinguished from earned income, working and professional women need not be concerned.

Assuming that only a limited number of women are involved, it nevertheless remains true that an evil principle introduced into our law is *an evil principle whether it applied to one or to a million.* * * * *Third.* * * * the existent tax inequity in this case, if such it be, is certainly *not going to be resolved by the creation of a very much greater inequity* in another field. * * * *Fourth.* * * * Until our latest income-tax law, marriage had always been favored. * * * But now not content with removing this discrimination in favor of marriage our legislators would now apparently rush to the opposite extreme and *impose a greater burden upon marriage.* * * * What is the meaning of this sudden penalizing of the institution which for years it has been accepted public policy to favor? * * * *Fifth.* Justification of the greater burden upon marriage, namely, that the family unit is a natural unit for tax purposes, is unsound in this connection because the husband and wife relationship is far from being the only family relationship. * * * (Pages 1253-1256).

* * *

Other witnesses elaborated on one or more of these themes. During the two-day session one was constantly reminded of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, of South Carolina, Minister to France, who in 1796, when it was intimated that peace might be granted in return for money, exclaimed: "Millions for defense, but not a cent for tribute."

(*Note.* Send to Mr. Barron K. Grier, Clerk of the House Ways and Means Committee, for a copy of the Hearings Nos. 15, 16. Follow the arguments of men and women who seek to prevent thrusting women back into the chattel class for the sake of money. Other excerpts will follow in the May issue.)

ALVA BELMONT LIBRARY

Mary Elizabeth Downey, *Librarian*

Study groups continue to use the Library evenings. The informal group which has completed the reading and discussion of Pearl Buck's *"Of Men and Women,"* will continue next autumn.

Authors are being invited to review books of their own. This reading of books related to the woman movement might be followed by the Branches of the N. W. P. throughout the country, as a means of education on the subject.

Since our last report, gifts of books, pamphlets and clippings are acknowledged from Mrs. Robert M. Adamson; Mrs. Nora Stanton Barney; May H. Bacon Boggs; Lavina Dock; Mrs. Edna S. Capewell; Mabel B. Hayes; Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles; Marion May, Ransdell Inc., Pub. Co.; and Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley.

The following books or others devoted to our subject will be gladly received:

Bradstreet, *Works; in Prose and Verse;* Dill, *Women as World Builders;* Dexter, *Colonial Women of Affairs;* Earle, *Margaret Winthrop;* Ellett, *Women of the American Revolution;* Fairchild, *Oberlin, the Colony and the College;* Fowler, *Women on the American Frontier;* Godey's Lady's Book (any volume); Goodwin, *Dolly Madison;* Hays, *Women of the Day;* Higginson, *Margaret Fuller Ossoli;* Livermore, *Story of My Life;* McLean, *Wage-earning Women;* Mozans, *Women in Science;* Ossoli, *Women in the Nineteenth Century;* Parlman, *Heroines of Service;* Parton, Greeley, etc., *Eminent Women of the Age;* Richards, *Life of Julia Ward Howe;* Rosenberry, *History of the Association of American Women;* Schreiner, *Biography of Olive Schriner;* Shaw, *Story of a Pioneer;* Spencer, *Woman's Share in Social Culture;* Tarbell, *The Business of Being a Woman;* Thompson, *Woman;* Victor (ed.), *Life of Marie E. Zakrzewska;* Welsh, *Reminiscences of Thirty Years;* Wood, *History of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.*

A Feminist Thinks It Over

By ALMA LUTZ

WOMEN AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

ALL of us, men and women, have come to realize these past months the full significance of the Bill of Rights in the life of a free people. We are grateful and proud that our forefathers were wise enough to demand for the protection of American freedom the ten amendments to the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights.

As the need has arisen, four more amendments, embodying guarantees of civil liberties, have been added to the original ten amendments—the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth, and abolishing slavery and giving full citizenship to the Negro, and the Nineteenth Amendment, extending to women the right to vote.

One more Amendment is needed to complete our Bill of Rights and extend full citizenship to women—the Equal Rights Amendment.

When the Constitution was drafted and adopted, the common law attitude toward woman prevailed and she was not considered a separate legal entity. This attitude has shadowed the interpretations of the Courts throughout the years.

Hopefully, Virginia Minor and Susan B. Anthony attempted to prove their right to vote under the Fourteenth Amendment believing that those fine-sounding phrases must apply to women as well as to black men. But the Courts decided otherwise. Since then women have been granted the right to vote by a separate Amendment, the Nineteenth.

Hopefully, the women of Massachusetts, reading a State Statute which provided that "a person qualified to vote for representatives of the General Court shall be liable to serve as a juror," believed that they, because of the adoption of the Nineteenth Amendment, were eligible for jury service. They tested it in the Courts only to be faced with this decision:

> "The change in the legal status of women wrought by the 19th Amendment was radical, drastic, and unprecedented. While it is to be given full effect in its field, it is not be to extended by implication. It is unthinkable that those who first framed and selected the words for the statute now embodied in G. L. c. 234 sect. 1 had any design that it should ever include women within its scope.
>
> "It is equally inconceivable that those who from time to time had re-enacted that statute had any such design. When they used the word 'person' in connection with those qualified to vote for members of the more numerous branch of the general court, to describe those liable for jury service, no one contemplated the possibility of women becoming so qualified. No intention to include women can be deduced from omission of the word 'male'."

It must be obvious to any thinking person that if women are to receive the full protection of the Bill of Rights, another Amendment must be added, clearly defining women's complete and full citizenship. The Equal Rights Amendment is the answer. In these days when we are fighting to preserve democratic government we can do no less than prove our good faith by writing into our Constitution rights for women equal to those enjoyed by men.

WANTED—Complete file of the *Suffragist* for 1919 and 1920; also single copies, Sept.-Dec., 1919, and Jan., July, Nov., 1920; complete file of *Equal Rights* 1923.

What is your price? Write ALMA LUTZ, 22 River St., Boston.

The Bookshelf

WOMEN FOR DEFENSE. By Margaret Culkin Banning. Duell, Sloan and Pearce, N. Y. $2.50.

Any one who has the slightest doubt regarding women's ability to play an important role in the defense of our country would do well to read Mrs. Banning's book. She shows us women's amazing adaptability to new demands and new work. She tells us what women were able to accomplish in 1919 and 1918 when they were comparatively untrained for the tasks which confronted them. She reviews for us the remarkable, half-forgotten progress made by women between 1918 and 1942. During these years women were enfranchised, held public office, were finally recognized officially by political parties, entered business, industry, and the professions in numbers heretofore undreamed of. Progress for women was decidedly one of the signs of the times until suddenly in the early thirties a new philosophy regarding women began to develop in the world. This philosophy attempted to undermine all the progress that women have made and is today one of the basic creeds of the Axis nations.

Mrs. Banning says: "Quite outspokenly the Nazi enemies of democracy do not approve of, nor would they tolerate, the woman who has been built up and advantaged under the democratic system. . . . The American woman, if this war should be lost by the democracies, would be dominated by an idea opposed to almost every phase of development which we have come to take for granted in our country. . . . Now the average woman may have heard all this, but it has not quite sunk into her consciousness. She still has to credit the fact that the philosophy of woman's progress goes along with democracy, stands or falls with it. . . . For this Nazi philosophy does not demote man as it does woman. It will use him if it can convert him. He will be one of the superior sex. That the aims it offers man are limited, spurious and vicious is true, but it offers woman far less. Her role is subservience and use under the Nazi system."

Because of this, Mrs. Banning believes that every woman has a definite task to perform in the defense of the ideals we cherish, and that this defense cannot be left to any organization or group of organizations, but must go with women into the home, into the job, into the mind, and must extend into the subsequent peace.

Mrs. Banning expects rewards for women after this war as after the last. Women, she says, face these critical days with a great increase in capacities, with new ambitions, new plans. They can make themselves indispensible. Therefore they must insist that in the period of readjustment they be not penalized or discriminated against because they are women. They must have a seat at the council tables and a stronger voice in national and world conferences. They will look ahead to and prepare for a future with no more war. Mrs. Banning calls upon women for an imaginative response to the present and the unfolding future.

ALMA LUTZ.

FAITH IN IDEALS

I am of the opinion the real fundamental cause of much of our disunity both from international policy and in our own domestic economy is the weakening of faith in ideals. Equality is the pillar of liberty, it is the shelter of justice, it is a vision of today which must become a reality of tomorrow.

—CATHERINE R. DOBBS, *Chairman, Young Adults.*